UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,818	03/31/2004	Pierre Busson	361170-1029	5283
	7590 03/31/200 YNNE SEWELL LLP	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION 3000 THANKSGIVING TOWER 1601 ELM ST			LOUIE, OSCAR A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX 7	75201-4761	2436		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/814,818	BUSSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
OSCAR A. LOUIE	2436		

	OSCAR A. LOUIE	2436	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 March 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed. 	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co See Continuation Sheet.	mpliant Amendment (l	,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 6,18,35 and 53. Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7-17,19-34,36-52,54 and 55. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	」 will not be entered, or b) ⊠ wil	•	_
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Nasser G Moazzami/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436	/O. A. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 2436		

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Specification Objections (Claims 1-55), 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd (Claims 1-55).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- The applicants' arguments with respect to the "RF" have been carefully considered but are non-persuasive, because although Tan does not explicitly disclose "RF" it is reasonable to expect the digital/analog receiver to support radiofrequency since satellite communications for receiving signals is one of the more commonly used methods of communications that analog/digital receivers would be able to process;
- The applicants' "single substrate" arguments have been addressed in the previous office action dated 01/22/2009;
- The applicant's additional "single substrate" arguments with respect to the "mixed analog and digital circuitry" as claimed by the applicant, have been carefully considered but the particular point that "a single substrate is not an obvious engineering choice because the noise of the baseband digital circuitry can have adverse effects on the operation of the RF circuitry" appears to not be claimed in the current set of claims, that is this improvement/benefit is not readily appreciated based on the current claim language; the examiner suggests that inclusion of this limitation would better clarify the scope of the applicants' invention as claimed;
- The examiner maintains his position that inclusion of any of the objected as allowable claims (6, 18, 35, & 53) into all of the applicants' independent claims will place the applicants' claims into condition for allowance.